

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Littleton, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023759 A1 ("Littleton"). Claims 1-5, 11-15 and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of all pending claims.

As noted, independent Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Littleton. Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for synchronizing a computing device to a server, comprising:

receiving a record extraction sequence ID from the server;

comparing the received record extraction sequence ID from the server with a record extraction sequence ID obtained during a prior synchronization;

rolling back all transactions on the computing device that occurred since the prior synchronization;

extracting a first record from a database that has changed since the prior synchronization and that is relevant to the computing device if the record extraction sequence ID matches the previously obtained record extraction sequence ID;

extracting a second record from the database that has changed since the prior synchronization and that is relevant to the computing device if the record extraction sequence ID matches the previously obtained record extraction sequence ID;

importing the extracted first and second records after rolling back all transactions on the computing device that occurred since the prior synchronization.

The Office Action cites to paragraphs [0026] and [0032] of Littleton as teaching independent Claim 1's requirement. Paragraphs [0026] and [0032] provide as follows:

[0026] The telephone-provisioning conduit 122 is operable either in a fast synchronization mode or in a slow synchronization mode. In the fast synchronization mode, only those records that the server knows are modified are retrieved by the telephone-provisioning conduit. Additionally, if there are records that have been modified on the PDA side but the corresponding records (i.e., record with same identification number) are not included in the list of records that came down initially from the server, the telephone-provisioning conduit will request that those records be fetched from the server database. In the slow synchronization mode, all records from the server database are read by the telephone-provisioning conduit. The telephone-provisioning conduit 122 is operable either in a fast synchronization mode or in a slow synchronization mode. In the fast synchronization mode, only those records that the server knows are modified are retrieved by the telephone-provisioning conduit. Additionally, if there are records that have been modified on the PDA side but the corresponding records (i.e., record with same identification number) are not included in the list of records that came down initially from the server, the telephone-provisioning conduit will request that those records be fetched from the server database. In the slow synchronization mode, all records from the server database are read by the telephone-provisioning conduit.

[0032] As a record is read in during synchronization process, a checksum value is computed for that record and is compared with one of the checksum values contained in the map files that is associated with same record identification number to determine if the record has been modified since the previous synchronization. If the checksum value of a record does not match the checksum value in the map files, the record will be presumed to be modified. If the identification number of a record does not match any of the entries contained in the map files, the record will be presumed to be new. During this synchronization process, the map files get updated with computed checksum values of the modified and new records.

Paragraph [0026] describes retrieving records in a fast or slow synchronization mode. In a fast synchronization mode, only those records that the server knows are modified are retrieved by the telephone-processing conduit. In the slow synchronization mode, all records are read by the telephone-provisioning conduit. Paragraph [0032]

makes clear that a checksum value is computed for each record read during the synchronization process. More particularly, a checksum value is computed for that record and is compared with one of the checksum values contained in a file that is associated with the same record identification number to determine if the record has been modified since the previous synchronization. Paragraph [0032] makes clear that a distinct checksum value is computed and compared for each record read during the synchronization process. In contrast, independent Claim 1 as amended recites extracting first and second records from a database that have changed since the prior synchronization and that are relevant to the computing device if one record extraction sequence ID matches the previously obtained record extraction sequence ID. In other words, Claim 1 makes clear that both the first and second records are extracted when a single record extraction sequence ID is compared. Given that paragraphs [0026] and [0032] of Littleton do not teach or fairly suggest this limitation, either alone or in combination with the remaining limitations of independent Claim 1, Applicants submit that independent Claim 1 as amended is patentably distinguishable over the cited sections of Littleton.

Independent Claims 6, 11, 16, 21 and 26 have been amended to recite limitations which are similar or identical to those added to independent Claim 1 as discussed above. In light of the fact that independent Claim 1 has been shown to be patentably distinguishable over the cited sections of Littleton, it follows that the remaining independent claims are likewise patentably distinguishable. Given that all independent claims are shown to be patentably distinguishable over Littleton, it follows that the remaining dependent claims are likewise distinguishable.

As noted above, independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In this rejection the Office Action asserts that **reversing** all transactions on the computing device that occurred since the prior synchronization, is not explicitly described in the Specification or sufficiently clear for one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize this step as it contains in independent Claim 1 prior to amendment. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 by replacing the term “reversing” with rolling back. Thus, independent Claims 1, 11, and 26 now recite rolling back all transactions on the computing device that occurred since the prior synchronization. Support for this claim limitation can be found in paragraph [0047] of the instant application. Applicants submit that the amendments to independent Claims 1, 11, and 26 bring these claims into compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5097.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric A. Stephenson
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 38,321
Telephone: (512) 439-5093
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099